

ROSEMARY M. RIVAS (SBN 209147)
LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 291-2420
Facsimile: (415) 484-1294
Email: rrivas@zlk.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

[Additional Counsel listed on signature block.]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

MARC NUZZO, On Behalf of Himself and All
Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

INVENSENSE, INC., BEHROOZ ABDI, AMIR
FAINTUCH, USAMA FAYYAD, EMIKO
HIGASHI, JON OLSON, AMIT SHAH, ERIC
STANG, YUNBEI YU, TDK CORPORATION,
and TDK SENSOR SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00859-JD

CLASS ACTION

NOTICE OF AGREEMENT

Judge: Hon. James Donato

WHEREAS, on May 24, 2017, the parties in the above-captioned class action (the “Action”) filed a Stipulation Concerning Plaintiff’s Voluntary Dismissal of the Above Action and Plaintiff’s Counsel’s Anticipated Application for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses (the “Stipulation of Dismissal”) (Dkt. No. 16);

WHEREAS, on May 26, 2017, the Court granted in part the Stipulation of Dismissal and ordered that the case remain open for an additional 45 days and that if no fee application is filed by that time, the case will be closed (Dkt. No. 17);

WHEREAS, the Parties to this Action, as well as in the other related cases¹, have reached a collective agreement to resolve the intended fee application;

NOW, THEREFORE, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Parties submit that it would be appropriate for the Court to close this Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2017

LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP

By: /s/ Rosemary M. Rivas
 Rosemary M. Rivas
 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 291-2420
 Facsimile: (415) 484-1294

OF COUNSEL:

Seth D. Rigrodsky (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Gina M. Serra (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
RIGRODSKY & LONG, P.A.
 2 Righter Parkway, Suite 120
 Wilmington, DE 19803
 Telephone: (302) 295-5310

Attorneys for Plaintiff

¹ In addition to the present Action, five later filed actions were commenced against Defendants. *See Chicorel v. InvenSense, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 5:17-cv-00901; *Dunham v. InvenSense, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 5:17-cv-00957; *Isaac v. InvenSense, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-01014; *Holzman v. InvenSense, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-01038; *Rollins v. InvenSense, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-01574. Pursuant to the Court’s Order on June 27, 2017, the Court related the five later filed actions to this Action (Dkt. No. 19).